

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 remain pending in the present application, Claims 1, 5, and 7-9 having been amended, and Claims 10-13 having been added. Support for the amendments to Claims 1 and 7-9 is found, for example, in Figs. 3 and 7, for example. Claim 5 is amended to correct a minor informality. Support for new Claims 10-13 is found, for example, in Fig. 4 for example. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) an unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Art in view of Kurata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,799,120, hereinafter Kurata); Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) an unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Art (“AAA”) in view of Kurata, and further in view of Kunikane et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,547, hereinafter Kunikane); Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Wright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,411,410, hereinafter Wright) in view of Kurata; Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) an unpatentable over Wright in view of Kurata, and further in view of Kunikane; Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) an unpatentable over Wright in view of Kurata, and further in view of Rivoallan (U.S. Patent No. 6,130,974); Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) an unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Art in view of Kurata, and further in view of Rivoallan (U.S. Patent No. 6,130,974); Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) an unpatentable over Wright in view of Kurata, and further in view of Ellison et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,556,757, hereinafter Ellison); Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) an unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Art in view of Kurata, and further in view of Ellison; Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) an unpatentable over Kunikane et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,547, hereinafter Kunikane) in view of Wright, Feldman et al. (U.S.

Application No. 10/049,613
Reply to Office Action of December 8, 2006

Patent No. 6,577,414, hereinafter Feldman), and further in view of Kurata; and Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Kunikane in view of Wright and Schmack et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,481,621), and further in view of Kurata.

Amended Claims 1 and 7-9 recite, *inter alia*,

wherein the subscriber unit with the video receiver is configured to separate the video signal from the multiplexed signal received at the wavelength division multiplexer/demultiplexer and to input the video signal to the video receiver, and


wherein the subscriber unit without the video receiver is configured to separate the video signal from the multiplexed signal received at the wavelength division multiplexer/demultiplexer, to remove the video signal without termination, to separate the signals other than the video signal, and to input the signal other than the video signal to a transmitting and receiving section.

The AAA and the cited references, do not disclose or suggest the above-noted features of amended Claims 1 and 7-9. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 7-9 (and any claims dependent thereon) patentably distinguish over the art of record.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Joseph Wrkich
Registration No. 53,796

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)